

*Clean Air Strategy Project Team
Meeting #3*

Date: November 8, 2007
Time: 10.00 am to 3.30 pm
Place: CASA, Edmonton

Name	Organization
In Attendance	
Jennifer Allan	CASA
Len Bracko	Alberta Urban Municipalities Association
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Gerry Ertel (Phone)	Shell Canada & CPPI
Long Fu	AB Environment
Tony Hudson	Alberta Lung Association
Steve Kennett	Pembina Institute
Alex Mackenzie	Alberta Health and Wellness
Ken Omotani	TransAlta
Colin Pate	Alberta Energy
Carmen Rieder	CASA
Anita Sartori	CNRL, CAPP
Nashina Shariff	Toxics Watch
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

Regrets	
Christine Byrne	Imperial Oil, CAPP
Debra Code	Enmax
Caroline Kolebaba	Alberta Coalition of Municipal Districts and Counties
Martha Kostuch	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Al Mok	Suncor, CAPP
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Jason Schultz	TransCanada
Srikanth Venugopal	TransCanada

Action Items:

3.1	Industry caucus should discuss membership of other industries to finalize the membership issue	Al Mok	Next meeting
3.2	Compile a list of information identified and gathered by the team, according to these questions.	Jennifer	Before next meeting
3.3	Create the parking lot list and append it to all of the minutes for the team's reference.	Jennifer	Before next meeting
3.4	Develop a list of secretariat functions currently	Jennifer	Before next

	performed by CASA and other functions that the team could hire a person(s) to perform.		meeting
3.5	The public consultation subgroup will prepare two RFPs and circulate to the group via email.	Tony, Anita, Bettina	Next meeting
3.6	Jennifer, Kerra and co-chairs will write up develop a workplan and plan to help the team move forward.	Co-chairs, Kerra, Jennifer	Next co-chairs call

1. Greetings & Introductions

2. Administration

a. Approve agenda:

- Agenda items were rearranged to accommodate presentation by Randy Angle's presentation at 11am. New order of was decided to be: 1, 2, 6, 4, 3, 5, 7-10. This effectively moved the discussion of the 'top 4 boxes' to the afternoon.
- As reflected below, the afternoon agenda was again changed. Instead of moving through the top 4 boxes, the team felt the following agenda would best serve the current state of knowledge and team development:
 - De-brief from Randy's presentation: expectations and direction for this Project Team
 - Process of designing a Clean Air Strategy for Alberta
 - Discussion the RFPs for the 1991 strategy and the public consultation

b. Minutes from 12Oct07 approved as drafted. There were a few minor corrections from Bettina sent via email, which will be included before the minutes are finalized.

c. Review of action items:

Action Items:

1.1	Bettina to contact Tim from Environment Canada about joining the team.	Bettina	
	<i>Bettina contacted Tim via phone but has not yet received a response.</i>		Next meeting
1.2	Kerra to find out how much the public consultation for Water for Life cost.	Bettina	
	<i>Kerra will follow up with Bettina.</i>		Next meeting
1.6	Bettina and Long to report on AENV's expectations for a public consultation.	Bettina, Long	
	<i>Public consultation subgroup met last week. Ideas were forwarded from AENV.</i>		Done
1.7	Kerra to collect past CASA evaluations and the	Kerra, Jennifer	

	team will discuss further which parts of the existing strategy are still valuable.		
	Jennifer will assist Kerra – to be completed for next meeting.		Next meeting
2.1	Contact EPCOR and ATCO for inclusion in this team	Al	
	Ken reported that Al has contacted EPCOR and ATCO; outcome pending		Next meeting
2.2	Participation by the EUB will be discussed by Bettina and Colin Pate (Alberta Energy).	Bettina	
	Collin agreed that EUB should be invited. Bettina should contact Kim.		Next meeting
2.3	The Ambient / Emissions Subgroup tasked with reviewing information for the team will report back at the Dec 5 meeting.	Martha, Bettina, Long, Jason	Dec 5
	Item for next meeting.		
2.4	The co-chairs will present the timeline and budget again at the Dec 5 meeting	Co-chairs	Dec 5
	Item for next meeting.		
2.5	The co-chairs will present the consultant RFP at the Nov 8 meeting	Co-chairs	Nov 8
	To be discussed at today's meeting		
2.6	The Info Workshop Subgroup will contact speakers and arrange for presentations at the Nov, Dec and Jan meetings.	Bettina, Debra, Nashina	Ongoing next 3 meetings
	To be discussed at today's meeting		
2.7	The public consultation subgroup will report at the Nov 8 meeting.	Bettina, Anita, Tony	Nov 8
	To be discussed at today's meeting		
2.8	Role of municipalities – determine who should present to the team or if information should be gathered by the Information Subgroup	Len, Carolyn	
	Carolyn and Len will present at the Dec 5 meeting		Dec 5
2.9	Srikanth will ask for someone to present on the federal framework and integration (Cecilia Clereau or Mike Biel)	Srikanth	Report to either CASA or Info Workshop Subgroup by Nov 1
	Jennifer will contact Srikanth to follow up.		

d. Team membership discussion:

A member asked if the industry reps represent companies or associations. Specifically, is CAPP represented? It was clarified that CAPP is represented by CNRL, Suncor and Imperial Oil.

The following industries were identified as potentially missing: Chemical producers of Alberta and the Forestry industry.

The team discussed potential 'cut offs' for new members. While it is important to bring stakeholders to the table, the team is moving quickly and there is a lot of information that a new member would have to catch up on.

The team agreed that a 'team membership' would no longer be a standing item on the agenda. If there is need to bring in a new stakeholder, the team can discuss that at a later date.

Action Item 3.1: Industry caucus should discuss membership of other industries to finalize industry's membership (Al Mok).

3. Check in with Subgroups

a. Public Consultation Subgroup

The public consultation subgroup presented their initial ideas, but noted there was not quorum at their subgroup meeting. Therefore, the subgroup does not have an agreed-upon consultation plan. However, the sector that not able to make the meeting was contacted. The subgroup proposes an RFP for a consultant to provide consultation options. The subgroup would also like to kick off the consultation with a discussion paper, described below.

The two members of the subgroup at the meeting presented their discussion (again, not agreement because there was not quorum).

In general, there is a belief that the team should consult early and often because the public is interested in environmental issues. Public consultation was an important and successful element of the 1991 strategy.

The estimated cost of the RFP (or possibly Request for Quotes – RFQ) was \$20,000-\$25,000 for both the discussion paper and the drafted consultation options.

There are two parts to the RFP/RFQ: a discussion paper and a consultation plan.

- Discussion paper: The subgroup envisions a strategic discussion paper that would identify:
 - Key air quality issues
 - Key substances
 - Actions that may make the present situation worse
 - Actions to keep the air reasonably clean.
 - The discussion paper might take the format of “20 Things We Need to Know” or “An Idiot’s Guide to Clean Air in Alberta”.

The purpose of the discussion paper is to level the playing field of environmental knowledge and cut through the many environmental messages the public is exposed to. The discussion paper would also translate the complexities of air quality issues into language easily understood by the public. The goal is to begin dialogues.

The subgroup also feels this discussion paper would be of value for the entire team. Identifying key issues and priorities would be a useful exercise.

The team discussed the added-value of the discussion paper. Some felt that educating the public was a useful approach. There were concerns that if we feed the public messages, we may only get that same information back in the consultation.

Team members also felt that there is many ways this discussion paper could be used. One of which is a communications document for the entire team. That document could then be tailored for various purposes. As such, there were questions whether the discussion paper and public consultation pieces should be part of the same RFP.

There was a more general discussion about the scope of public consultation. Some felt that there wasn't a need to do a large scale public consultation, instead focus groups would be more effective. The subgroup agreed that focus groups could be effective and that the subgroup planned to use a variety of methods to ensure a targeted, nimble and cost-effective public consultation.

Further discussion postponed in order to make time for Randy Angle's presentation.

4. Clean Air Strategy 1991: Randy Angle

a. Copies of the PowerPoint slides were distributed to the team in hardcopy. Electronic copies were emailed to the team before the meeting.

Randy's presentation provided an overview of the process that created the 1991 Strategy, some lessons learnt and some ideas about strategic planning today. The presentation also answered some specific questions that were posed to help provide context for this team. These questions were (slides 15-21):

- What was the extent of implementation of the 1991 strategy?
- How was content decided?
- What design process was used?
- How were issues prioritized?
- What was done prior to 1991?
- What were some of the struggles?

The team found the answers to these questions useful and they generated a lot of discussion in the afternoon. In particular, the questions regard prioritizing issues and deciding content were discussed.

b. Questions:

Q1: How were decisions made with respect to process design, content and prioritization of issues?

A1: Background reports were produced by the working group and the advisory board made decisions based on these reports. The working group was responsible for drafting the fact sheets, background papers and final report. The advisory group provided input and overall direction.

There were some struggles regarding priorities, but the criteria were:

- Agreed-upon problem definition
- Ease of implementation
- Significance to Alberta

Q2: What would you have done differently?

A2: We did the best that could be done at that time. Saskatchewan and BC undertook similar projects but with different processes. At the time, multi-stakeholder and consensus decision making was novel.

Today, the process will be different. Touchstones from the 1991 report may remain the same while the actionables may need to be changed. A solid plan is also required to build upon the 1991 report.

Q3: What public consultation would be needed today?

A3: This is for the stakeholders to decide. We undertook extensive public consultation at the time; it is up to this team to undergo the consultation level they feel suits their purposes and resources. CASA has experience with public consultations (Electricity framework) that may be beneficial.

Q4: Were stakeholder groups (government, NGOs, industry) asked what was wanted for public consultation before a strategy was designed?

A4: Yes. Financial limitations were then applied, and through an iterative process, the final public consultation strategy was developed.

Q5: How should relevant issues be scoped and prioritized?

A5: You should be as comprehensive as possible. Some issues will be more difficult and require more careful planning than others.

There is a balance to be struck regarding province-wide and local air quality issues, but for the most part the criteria allowed the working group to identify priorities. We kept an eye on what could be implemented, to keep the strategy workable and realistic.

Q6: Would you hire a consultant to review implementation of the 1991 strategy?

A6: This would be a very difficult and extensive task. If a recommendation was implemented, you would see the results and if not, there would be a reason. Several reviews of the strategy have already been written ("10 Successes in 10 Years of CASA" and a review paper by Randy and a collaborator). Also noted in the presentation, all 15 of the priority tasks were implemented.

Q7: Can categories of issues that the CASA system has handled be grouped into “well done” and “did not work well”?

A7: You could get a sense of what has been adequately addressed from such a review (re: reviewing the implementation of the 1991 report); however, new issues may be overlooked if focus is placed exclusively on the 1991 report. The strategy also has to look forward.

Q8: What other issues are there for the CASA system?

A8: Transportation – the vehicle emission team at CASA is finding implementation a challenge.

Q10: The Industrial Heartland Emission Caps framework was put out recently. These initiatives need to be part of this team’s strategy but the group has not received guidance on implementation. Can you comment on the disconnect?

A9: Ideally, the strategy would come before cumulative effects regulation. It would be useful to know what is contained in the cumulative effects initiative.

Q11: What is the expectation for this team?

A10: The new strategy should look more like the Water-For-Life strategy. That strategy underwent a large-scale development similar to the 1991 Clean Air Strategy. Currently, they are undergoing a renewal – similar to this Clean Air Strategy Project team’s work. Water for Life’s renewal occurred sooner after the strategy’s development than the Clean Air Strategy, but the process is similar.

5. Discussion based on Randy Angle’s presentation

The members felt strongly that the group should discuss new thoughts and ideas sparked by Randy’s presentation. Also, there were outstanding decisions regarding RFPs discussed in the morning.

Generally, it was felt that the team could not begin working down the 1991 Pyramid without a clear idea where this strategy was headed. The team wanted to discuss the purpose of their work, which would inform future decisions, information gathering and consultant hiring.

It was noted that discussing the process (not only the outcomes) of the team’s work are normal and valuable conversations for CASA teams. It helps the team ‘get on the same page’ and provides a clearer path ahead, which was team-built.

Some of the key discussion areas that came to light during the conversation were:

Scope & Expectations

The team wanted clarification on expectations for the team. It was clarified that AENV is prefers an update approach for this Clean Air Strategy, but can be flexible if the team identifies new priorities. This expectation can be further clarified at future meetings.

It was noted that there seem to be two ideas floating around the team. One is that this Clean Air Strategy should be 'big and bold' and do what is best for Alberta (i.e. not only look to the old strategy, but create whatever strategy is currently appropriate). The other feels that this team should update the 1991 Strategy.

The team members in favour of updating the 1991 strategy pointed out that we are not starting from scratch. Our strategy should build on the 1991 report. We need to look not at costs but at what we have already, what we want to do and where we want to go. Fundamentally, the 1991 strategy works. We need to determine where it needs fine-tuning and revision.

There are lessons to be learned from the 1991 Strategy that can provide direction from some of this team's work. For example, recommendations related to vehicle emissions issues were not implemented successfully because of confusion over the role of Alberta Transportation. The new strategy must be attentive to the mandate of applicable government departments. Initiatives that worked well were entirely within the regulatory tools of Alberta Environment while recommendations that fell outside the jurisdiction of Alberta Environment were not successful. Another example was broader initiatives (energy efficiency, role of public) are more complex and were not successfully implemented. These factors should be considered in the new strategy.

The discussion regarding developing a new strategy centered on the today's conditions versus those in 1991. A new plan is required to suit Alberta's needs now. If some of the same issues are important now that were also important in 1991, these issues will come forward in the process of strategy development.

It was noted that only the scale of the problems have changed since 1991, not the problems themselves. Updating the 1991 strategy might be 'big and bold' if that is what is right for Alberta looking forward.

The team agreed to start with deciding Alberta's current priorities (emissions, drivers, issues), and to develop criteria to sort out priorities. The team also agreed there is a lot of value in the 1991 report that should be retained.

Process

The team discussed how to go about developing a strategy – or renewing a strategy – given timelines and resources.

There were several suggestions how to frame the team's future work. One suggestion was to develop a Table of Contents, then work to fill in the report. Other suggests were to develop an analytic framework that would identify the strategic questions for the team and work to fill in the gaps.

The team produced a list of these strategic questions:

- What are the key emissions trends?

- What are the drivers of these trends?
- Why are we having trouble managing these trends?
- Where are the gaps? Or new, emerging issues?
- What's missing from the 1991 report?

It was noted that the group has already started collecting information on some of these questions.

Action Item 3.2: Jennifer is to compile a list of information identified and gathered by the team, according to these questions.

There was also a discussion on what tools could be effective to implement the strategy. There is currently an effort to prioritize various tools according to their effectiveness.

The team also discussed that a process is needed to collect ideas from meeting to meeting and to group these ideas or somehow make them accessible for future reference. At every team meeting, there are "gems" put forth that should be at least considered for inclusion in the final report.

The co-chairs also discussed this and tasked Jennifer with creating a parking lot of issues based up on previous meetings. This list will be added to after all meetings and appended to the minutes. There is also a software program called "Mind Manager" which might be useful.

Action Item 3.3: Jennifer to create the parking lot list and append it to all of the minutes for the team's reference.

Support

After Randy's presentation, the team wanted to discuss what support is available for their work. The work of the 1991 report was done by an advisory group and a work group. There was 2 full time secretariat staff.

It was noted that this team's work can build on what was already done and will operate differently than the 1991 strategy's development because we are a CASA team. At the time of the original strategy, CASA did not exist.

Some felt that there may be a need for a full-time staff person devoted solely to this team. The team suggested that person could be strategic planner or a report writer, with strategic planning skills. This person could: synthesize a work plan, identifying gaps in the process and information gathering and writing of the final report. The team conceded that some of these tasks are currently action items for team members; however, team members' time is limited and some action items are not being completed.

An option would be to hire a strategic planner for a team retreat. The strategic planner would help put the team's information in context and help the team develop the workplan and foundation for the strategy. This would also be a valuable team building exercise.

Action Item 3.4: Jennifer to develop a list of secretariat functions currently performed by CASA and other functions that the team could hire a person(s) to perform.

Budgetary support - 1.5 million was spent on public consultation for the 1991 report. The issues have not become less pressing.

Some team members felt we need to determine a path forward THEN budget and timelines can be set.

Others pointed out that we are not starting from scratch, as the 1991 Strategy did. Therefore, this team can be more cost-effective. Time and budget constraints have to be considered and should be reviewed as an iterative process with the development of the strategy.

Timeframe

There was a concern that presentations are not providing enough information for the team to produce a document at the level of the 1991 report. The team may need to review additional documents.

6. Request for Proposal(s)

There are two RFPs currently for discussion and decision. The first is the RFP drafted to study the implementation of the 1991 strategy. The second is the public consultation RFP briefly discussed this morning.

1991 Implementation RFP

Randy's presentation showed that the 15 priority tasks were implemented; however there were questions why other recommendations were not. Some of the ideas why recommendations were not implemented included: the issue was not important; it fell under another department's mandate; the strategy had too much detail and the public involvement was low.

The team felt that we need to have a clear idea of the strategy's purpose before we hire consultants.

The team decided to shelve this RFP for the time being. However, if there is a specific recommendation the team has questions about (why wasn't Recommendation ____ implemented?), the RFP would be revised and used.

Public consultation RFP:

The team again discussed the RFP, and re-affirmed that the discussion paper would have multiple uses for the team as a communications document, public consultation document and planning tool. It was also noted that the information already exists and another subgroup (Ambient/Emissions Subgroup) is collecting some of that information. The public consultation subgroup should be aware of what other subgroups are doing and what information is being collected.

Because of the many uses for the discussion paper, the team decided to split the public consultation RFP into two RFPs:

- 1) An RFP to prepare a discussion paper for use by the Project Team.
- 2) An RFP to develop options for public consultation.

Action Item 3.5: The public consultation subgroup will draft the two RFPs (discussion paper and consultation options) and circulate to the group via email.

There were clarifications on the CASA process and governance between the Project Team and the subgroups. The project team as a whole must approve any budgetary issues and recommendations made at the subgroup level. Specifically, **this team will approve RFPs drafted by subgroups and circulated before the meeting.**

7. Meeting Wrap-up

Based on today's discussion, the co-chairs and the secretariat will develop a workplan and discuss options for the team to move forward (including resources). This plan will be discussed at the December meeting.

Action Item 3.6: Jennifer, Kerra and co-chairs will write up develop a workplan and plan to help the team move forward.

Adjourned at 3:35PM.